

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-36, 41, 42, and 44-51 are pending, with claims 1, 25, and 44 being independent. Claims 9, 37-40, and 43 were previously cancelled and claims 1, 4, 7, 10-13, 17, 25, 26, 41, 42, and 49 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 17, 18, 21, 23-25, 30, 31, 34, 36, and 44-51 have been rejected as being anticipated by Yonezawa (U.S. Patent No. 7,187,402). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Yonezawa does not describe or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 25, and 44.

Specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, determining second locations for the sensors in the sensor array at a second time to provide second location information, the second locations being different from the first locations, and the second time being after the first time, and enabling the user to perceive the second location of one or more of the sensors in the sensor array on the perceived map, and independent claim 44 recites, in part, determining, at a second time, a second location of the first sensor and a second location of the second sensor, where the second time is after the first time, the first sensor's second location is different from the first sensor's first location, and the second sensor's second location is different from the second sensor's first location, and enabling display, to the user, of the first sensor's second location and the second sensor's second location on the map related to the entertainment event or venue.

Yonezawa discloses maps 510-540 of offices, shops, and/or warehouses with camera icons showing where the cameras are located within the different locations. *See* Yonezawa at FIG. 3. The locations of the cameras shown in maps 510-540 are fixed. *See* Yonezawa at col. 8, lines 38-40 ("Namely, the clicked camera is fixed.").

The Office Action equates, in connection with independent claim 44, the different camera locations of maps 510-540 to the recited second locations of the sensors. *See* Office Action mailed November 10, 2008 at page 8. However, as acknowledged by the Office Action, maps 510-540 are for different locations and, therefore, the cameras for each location are different. Moreover, Yonezawa explicitly states that the location of each camera is fixed and, therefore, the cameras do not have multiple locations. Therefore, Yonezawa does not describe or suggest determining second locations for the sensors in the sensor array at a second time where the second locations are different from the first locations, as recited in amended independent claim 1, or determining, at a second time, a second location of the first sensor and a second location of the second sensor, where the first sensor's second location is different from the first sensor's first location and the second sensor's second location is different from the second sensor's first location, as recited in independent claim 44.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 44 and their dependent claims.

Amended independent claim 25 recites features similar to those discussed above in connection with amended independent claim 1 and does so in the context of a tangible computer readable medium. Accordingly, at least for reasons similar to those discussed above in

connection with amended independent claim 1, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claim 25 and its dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

*Claims 4, 10-12, 41, and 42*

Claims 4, 10-12, 41, and 42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yonezawa in view of Valleriano (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2005/0093976). Valleriano, which is cited as allegedly disclosing the features of claims 4, 10-12, 41, and 42, does not cure the failure of Yonezawa to describe all of the features of amended independent claim 1, from which claims 4, 10-12, 41, and 42 depend. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 10-12, 41, and 42.

*Claims 14-16, 19, 20, 27-29, 32, and 33*

Claims 14-16, 19, 20, 27-29, 32, and 33 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yonezawa in view of McClintock (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,208). McClintock, which is cited as allegedly disclosing the features of claims 14-16, 19, 20, 27-29, 32, and 33, does not cure the failure of Yonezawa to describe all of the features of amended independent claims 1 and 25, from which claims 14-16, 19, 20, 27-29, 32, and 33 depend. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14-16, 19, 20, 27-29, 32, and 33.

*Claims 13 and 26*

Claims 13 and 26 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yonezawa in view of Bernardo (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0047895). Bernardo, which is cited as allegedly disclosing the features of claims 13 and 26, does not cure the failure of Yonezawa to describe all of the features of amended independent claims 1 and 25, from which claims 13 and 26 depend.

Moreover, Bernardo discloses a user identifying a location and retrieving *images* in a database associated with the location (see Bernardo at ¶ [0083]-[0084]), but it does not describe or suggest enabling a user to navigate among sensors in the sensor array and to select one or more of the sensors in the sensor array, as recited in claims 13 and 26.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 26.

*Claims 6, 22, and 35*

Claims 6, 22, and 35 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yonezawa in view of Ritchey (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,576). Ritchey, which is cited as allegedly disclosing the features of claims 6, 22, and 35, does not cure the failure of Yonezawa to describe all of the limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 25, from which claims 6, 22, and 35 depend. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 22, and 35.

*Claim 7*

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yonezawa and Ritchey, and in further view of Bernardo. Bernardo, which is cited as allegedly disclosing the features of claim 7, does not cure the failure of Yonezawa and Ritchey to describe all of the limitations of claim 6, from which claim 7 depends. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The fee in the amount of \$130 in payment of a one-month extension of time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits due in connection with this filing or otherwise to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/10/2009

  
Hussein Akhavannik  
Reg. No. 59,347

Customer No. 26171  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331